

2013

Mini-Grammar Lessons: The Pedagogical Application of a Syntactic Analysis to L2 Composition

Paul Keyworth
St. Cloud State University

Qian Li
St. Cloud State University

Follow this and additional works at: https://repository.stcloudstate.edu/stcloud_ling



Part of the [Applied Linguistics Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Keyworth, Paul and Li, Qian (2013) "Mini-Grammar Lessons: The Pedagogical Application of a Syntactic Analysis to L2 Composition," *Linguistic Portfolios*: Vol. 2 , Article 7.
Available at: https://repository.stcloudstate.edu/stcloud_ling/vol2/iss1/7

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by theRepository at St. Cloud State. It has been accepted for inclusion in Linguistic Portfolios by an authorized editor of theRepository at St. Cloud State. For more information, please contact rswexelbaum@stcloudstate.edu.

MINI-GRAMMAR LESSONS: THE PEDAGOGICAL APPLICATION OF A SYNTACTIC ANALYSIS TO L2 COMPOSITION

PAUL KEYWORTH AND QIAN LI

ABSTRACT

In this paper we demonstrate that by using syntax error-analysis from a single composition from an ESL learner, a succession of structure lessons can be devised based upon the principles of Chomsky's Generative Transformational Grammar (Koffi, 2010). This is analogous to the Cognitive Code Approach of the 1970s which was greatly influenced by the work of linguists and psycholinguists such as Chomsky and Miller (Celce-Murcia, 1991). We reveal that while mistakes are inevitable in the acquisition process, teachers can create personalized "mini-grammar lessons" (Celce-Murcia & Hilles, 1988, p.145) based on the identification of recurring patterns of errors in their students' compositions (Kroll & Schafer, 1978).

1.0 Introduction

When challenged with the complexity of dealing with syntactic errors in second language (L2) student writing, it is to be expected that, and many composition teachers prefer, to focus their feedback on issues of organization and content (Myers, 2003). In fact, proponents of the Communicative Language Teaching Approach (CLTA) have long argued against the "fixing" of students' sentence-level grammar, as if it is something that infringes upon the integrity of the author's work and goes against the natural laws of second language acquisition (SLA) (Myers, 2003).

Times change, however, and in this paper we intend to illustrate that it is in fact the "linguistic" constituents of word choice and syntax that L2 learners need just as much or more than the "writing" or rhetorical elements. Despite the recent "historic de-emphasis of sentence-level pedagogies due to a conception of culture which excludes the structure of languages" (Myers, 2003, p.52), a paradigm shift toward the Integrated Approach (IA) has led Language Arts professionals to now encourage teachers to use error-analysis to discover recurring patterns of error in their students' compositions and in order to provide the basis for creating practical grammar lessons for their students (Celce-Murcia, 1991; Ellis, 2006; Kroll & Schafer, 1978; Sheen, 2007; Sipple, 1978). Thus, the writing teacher as error-analyst scrutinizes error in order to ascertain how a pupil arrived at a mistake and then exploits this knowledge to assist the pupil in moving further toward the target-form. As Kroll and Schafer (1978) duly note:

Error-analysis can be seen as providing insights about the sources of an error but not dictating any single teaching device. In this view, error-analysis helps teachers utilize materials and teaching strategies more effectively by indicating the precise nature of the problem (p. 247).

In this paper it is posited that by using syntax error analysis from a single composition from an English language learner (ELL), a succession of structure lessons can be devised based upon the principles of Chomsky's Generative Transformational Grammar (GTG) (Koffi, 2010). Celce-

Murcia and Hilles (1988) has coined the phrase “mini-grammar lessons” for this type of remedial instruction. In fact, this method closely resembles the Cognitive Code Approach (CCA) of the 1970s which was greatly influenced by linguists and psycholinguists such as Chomsky and Miller (Celce-Murcia, 1991). In this technique, language learning was seen as hypothesis formation and rule acquisition as opposed to the behaviorist’s view that habit formation was the most decisive factor (Celce-Murcia, 1991). Therefore, teaching grammar was paramount, and rules were presented either inductively or deductively based on the inclinations of the students (Celce-Murcia, 1991). Moreover, errors were considered inevitable in the acquisition process and something that could be used advantageously by both teachers and learners (Celce-Murcia, 1991). According to Celce-Murcia (1991):

Error analysis and correction were seen as appropriate classroom activities, with the teacher facilitating peer and self-correction as much as possible. The source of errors was seen not only as transfer from the first language but also as normal language development (errors similar to early L1 errors) and/or the internal complexities of the target language. The focus was still largely sentence-oriented, and materials writers often drew on Chomsky's early work in generative grammar (p. 461).

Despite the fact that it never really became popular at the time, and was subsequently replaced by the CLTA, the CCA is actually very close to contemporary approaches to language learning – i.e. the IA where focus on form and noticing are considered important features of the acquisition process (“Ellis,” 2012).

In concordance with the CCA, Ferris’s (2002) seminal book, on the treatment of error in second language student writing, strongly advocates using errors as a teaching tool and supports her claims with numerous empirical data. She begins by detailing studies such as Truscott’s (1996) which show how marking errors has no gaugeable effect on reconstructing L2 student writing, but then methodically discredits them by presenting alternative studies which indicate that students’ writing skills will improve when error correction is correctly utilized. Table 1 highlights the finding of various studies conducted using Truscott’s (1996) evaluation criteria:

The researchers compare the writing of students who have received grammar correction over a period of time with that of students who have not. If correction is important for learning, then the former students should be better writers, on the average, than the latter. If the abilities of the two groups do not differ, then correction is not helpful. The third possibility, of course, is that the uncorrected students will write better than the corrected ones—in which case, correction is apparently harmful (p. 329).

Research question	Studies and findings
Do students who receive error correction produce more accurate texts than those who receive no error feedback?	Yes: Ashwell (2000), Fathman and Whalley (1990), Ferris and Roberts (2001), Kepner (1991) No: Polio et al. (1998) Unclear: Semke (1984)
Do students who receive error correction improve in accuracy over time?	Yes: Chandler (2003), Ferris (1995a, 1997), Ferris and Helt (2000), Frantzen (1995), Lalande (1982), Robb et al. (1986), Sheppard (1992) No: Cohen and Robbins (1976), Polio et al. (1998) Unclear: Semke (1984)

Table 1: Summary of research findings: What does the available research evidence demonstrate about the effectiveness of correction in L2 writing classes (Ferris, 2004, p. 51)

Ferris (2002) also explains the difference between “treatable” and “untreatable errors”. The former are linguistic items, such as the conjugation of verbs, which follow specific rules that can be taught. Conversely, the latter are errors dealing with articles or prepositions, which do not have easily identifiable rules and thus demand “more of a feel for the language” since they are idiosyncratic. She recommends that direct feedback (explicit written corrections) be used for untreatable errors and for lower-level L2 students who have not yet learned the rules of grammar responsible for the type of error. On the other hand, for higher-level students, she suggests using indirect feedback for treatable errors. Indirect feedback involves checking L2 compositions by adding check marks in the margin next to error-containing lines, or using coded symbols above errors. As such, in accordance with the CCA, indirect feedback raises the student’s awareness of the error and the learner has to employ “mental effort” to repair it (Ferris, 2002). Interestingly, in her final chapter, Ferris (2002) discusses ways of overcoming problems with learner errors which also include creating “mini lessons” which specifically target the errors of a particular student, along with suggestions to help learners to self-edit and make peer editing more productive.

Another important distinction that has been made is that of Burt’s (1975) “global” and “local” errors. Global errors obstruct comprehensibility and therefore pertain to the meaning and organization of a text. Burt (1975) lists the following four types of global error which are prevalent in L2 writers’ grammar:

- Wrong word order
*e.g. *English language use many people*
- Missing, wrong, or misplaced sentence connectors
*e.g. *He will be rich until he marry*
- Missing cues to signal obligatory exceptions to pervasive syntactic rules
*e.g. *The student’s proposal (was) looked into (by) the principal*
- Not observing selectional restrictions on certain lexical items
*e.g. * We amused that movie very much* (pp. 56-57).

Local errors refer to minor errors such as spelling, punctuation, or grammar that do not hinder comprehension of a text. It has been suggested that when responding to a writer’s paper, it is better to focus on global issues first, particularly when responding to a first draft. Local errors

can be discussed closer to the due date for essays (Frodeson, 2001; Ellis, 2006; Gass & Selinker, 2008).

Another point in favor of error-analysis, it has been observed that English as a Second Language (ESL) students “expect and appreciate” assistance in developing the language accuracy of their writing. Indeed, it is recommended that whenever feasible, the learners’ own written work should be used for activities and exercises (Frodeson, 2001). According to Sheen (2007), “when the focus is on linguistic correctness, teachers may achieve better results if they select a specific grammatical problem that they have observed in their students’ writing rather than a whole range of linguistic errors” (p. 278). As Frodeson (2001) states:

If the teaching environment permits conferencing with students outside of class, conferences are excellent opportunities to provide individual help. Alternatively, the teacher can hold “mini-conferences” with individuals or small groups in the classroom. In conferences, teachers can demonstrate directly the difficulties a reader might have as a result of the grammatical errors in the students’ writing. This setting allows the teacher to act as a collaborator rather than as an error detector/corrector. He or she can help students identify errors that create reader confusion or misinterpretation, explore the strategies for editing that best fit the writers’ learning styles, set goals for improvement, and assess progress in these goals. Students can also provide insight into the sources of error, ones that a teacher might not even have considered, such as interference from a third language or an inaccurately formulated “rule” (p. 246).

This technique is obviously akin to Celce-Murcia’s (1991) aforementioned “mini-grammar lessons” and Ferris’s (2002) “mini lessons”, and indeed it is the approach used in this paper. As Kroll and Schafer (1978) advise: “Such an approach seems most practical in a learning-center environment, where there is ample opportunity for individualization of instruction” (p.247). The Intensive English Center (IEC) at Saint Cloud State University (SCSU) is an excellent example of this type of educational facility due to the provision of personal tutors to students who are struggling in particular areas of ESL study. In their pragmatic work on error-analysis in teaching composition, Kroll and Schafer (1978) highlight the benefits of such personalized instruction over traditional feedback and classroom teaching:

The best way to show a student the source of his or her errors is in periodic conferences, in which the teacher can present evidence for the error from the student’s papers, summarize the conclusions about the possible sources of the error, and start the student working on materials specifically geared to the source of the error. In our view, such conferences are more effective than extensive annotations on papers (p. 247).

The writing sample used in this paper is entitled “*The Police*” (Appendix A) and was written by an 18 year-old Chinese male who at the time of writing was an Advanced-level student in Level 5 of the IEC. This particular student was having difficulties in the class and so was assigned a personal tutor. In order to help the student and tutor, significant errors will be identified and categorized according to GTG (Table 1 in Appendix B), Ferris’s (2002) treatable/untreatable criteria, and Burt’s (1975) global/local criteria. This type of well-designed system for keeping records of errors is important because inherently analysis necessitates searching for “systematicity and pattern” (Kroll & Schafer, 1978). Finally, we will discuss how

some of the more critical error analyses can be applied constructively in the development of a series of mini-tutorials (or periodic conferences if you will) on grammar.

2.0 The Violation of the Symmetry Constraint

According to Koffi (2010); “Conjunctions are closed class words whose sole purpose in language is to join words, phrases, and clauses together” (p. 337). That is to say, conjunctions serve as a connection that can put elements of discourse together. In this sense, conjunctions should be subject to a syntactic symmetry constraint, which means that the conjoined structures must belong to the same syntactic category. Unfortunately, this area is one of the most difficult items with which L2 learners are faced. Our subject shares the same problem. In his composition, error #5 (Appendix A) is identified as this type of error:

1. **I haven't interacted with American policemen yet, but I've saw them in many places, such as on the street or the mall and the airport.*

In this sentence, a mismatching can be easily recognized. Since “or” and “and” are coordinating conjunctions, they should follow the syntactic symmetry constraint. According to the phrase structure rules (PSR) for prepositional phrases this is represented as:

PP → PP Conj PPⁿ
(p.345)

In this particular situation, “the street, the mall and the airport” have different prepositions that assign the thematic role of ‘location’. Therefore, these three prepositions should not be omitted. The correct phrase should read:

2. [...] *such as **on** the street or **in** the mall and **at** the airport.*

This is a great rule to teach ELLs since it is very simple and from a socio-linguistic perspective, violation of this axiom serves as a ‘marker’ or ‘stereotype’. In addition, although the syntactic symmetry constraint is part of Universal Grammar (Koffi, 2010), in some languages such as Chinese, the spatial preposition need not be altered for each clause. Therefore, sentence number (1) is a direct result of negative transfer (Gass & Selinker, 2008). Furthermore, unlike other prepositional errors this is a treatable error since it follows a prescribed rule.

3.0 Adverbial Errors

Among the four major parts of speech, adverbs are the most flexible. In a functional sense, they can modify verbs, adjectives and adverbs themselves. In a positional sense, adverbs can be placed in anywhere in a sentence, at the beginning, middle and end of a sentence. Based on their unstable characteristics, adverbs can be a challenge for L2 learners. In his composition, our participant made several errors related to adverbs, including word choice and word order. From Appendix B we can see that adverbial errors tend to be global, since adverbs significantly affect meaning, and also untreatable due to the subtle nuances in connotation. Therefore, it is vital that teachers provide direct feedback to their students on these issues. Simply marking corrections on their texts will not help them to acquire the correct usages. We will now individually identify and explain some of them.

3.1 Temporal Adverbs

When he described policemen, he produced error #7 (Appendix A):

3. **Although they couldn't find the thief eventually, most of them have the sense of security and look like very courageous, professional and serious.*

According to Cowan (2008), the adverb <eventually> refers to an unspecified time in the future whereas <ultimately> means “in the end”. Since the event has already reached its conclusion, the correct word choice here is <ultimately>:

4. *Although they couldn't find the thief **ultimately**, [...]*

This is simply a case of incorrect word choice as the subject has not yet learned all of the intricate nuances between the different meanings of the temporal adverbs. This is to be expected since Hinkel's (1992) study found that Chinese conceptual notions of time differ markedly to those of English due to variations in their temporal relationships. To remedy this, we would ask the tutor to set a number of grammar and reading comprehension exercises that specifically focus on temporal adverbs including the two discussed here. Furthermore, we would ask that the tutor teach that these particular adverbs (i.e. eventually and ultimately) may occur in any of the five positions in English sentences according to the PSR illustrated by Koffi (2010) and that these different positions may themselves induce subtle differences in meaning:

$S \rightarrow (\text{AdvP}) \text{NP} (\text{AdvP}) \text{Aux}^1 (\text{AdvP}) \text{Aux}^2 \text{AdvP} \text{VP} (\text{AdvP})$
(p. 275)

3.2 Adverbial Subordinate Clauses of Concession

The second error we wish to highlight is also relevant to word choice. When using subordinate clauses of concession, several conjunctions can be selected, such as although, even though and though. These can be confusing for ELLs because of the semantic, phonological and orthographic similarities between the simple subordinator (though), the compound subordinator (although) and the complex subordinator (even though) (Koffi, 2010). Indeed, our subject mixed them up and produced ‘even although’ in error #10 (Appendix A) as follows:

5. **However, when I drove on the street, I usually felt a little bit nervous of the policemen who were standing in the center of the cross and staring at every driver passing by them, even although I have never break traffic rules.*

Of course, the subordinating conjunction should be ‘even though’ as in sentence (6):

6. *[...], **even though** I have never [...]*

It is easy to see how this can confound ELLs and we would recommend that repeated exposure to the target forms be administered by the tutor through a series of specialized subordinating conjunction exercises and communicative practice so that our student may acquire the correct usage by inculcation.

3.3 Degree Adverbs

Error #20 is actually a combination of incorrect word choice and word order:

7. **You are fine exactly!*

In this sentence, “exactly” is our focus. When using adverbs to modify adjectives, we should place adverbs in front of adjectives according to the PSR defined by Koffi (2010):

AdjP → (DegP) Adj (p. 237).

So, it can be “exactly fine”. However, native English speakers (NESs) never use “exactly” to modify “fine”. In this case, another degree adverb is necessary such as ‘completely’ or ‘absolutely’. Therefore, the correct sentence should read:

8. *You are **completely** fine.*

This example illustrates the importance of collocations in second language acquisition (SLA) and a number of studies have provided empirical evidence that we in fact acquire language in lexical “chunks” (Gass & Selinker, 2008). As Decarrico (2001) states:

Concerning collocational associations as memory aids, researchers have noted that vocabulary is best learned in context and that words that are naturally associated in a text are more easily learned than those having no associations (p. 292).

Therefore, in addition to teaching the student the pre-adjectival position of degree adverbs, through the graphical representation of PSR and simple tree diagrams, we would prescribe that the tutor provide focused practice exercises on collocates of degree words.

4.0 The Auxiliary Verb <Used to>

In his composition, there is one obvious error that should be given plenty of attention. The subject misused the idiomatic phrase <used to> in error #3 (Appendix A):

9. **I used to call the policemen one time for someone stealing my wallet at the mall, when I was senior high school student in China.*

Considering the situation he described, it was a one-time event that simply happened in the past. Conversely, <used to> is used to (not to be confused!) describe a “discontinued past habit” (Workman, 2008, p.43). Therefore, there is no sense in using <used to> instead of the simple past tense:

10. *I **called** the police(men) one time, for [...]*

The reason why the student made such a mistake is that he did not have a full understanding of <used to>, which according to *Dictionary.com* (2012) is an auxiliary verb that selects an infinitive (or implied infinitive) non-finite verb. When people use <used to> to talk about past actions, they imply that these actions were true at one time but are now no longer true. Moreover,

<used to> also indicates that the action will not happen again. On the contrary, the Past Simple tense is used for a “finished action in the past” (Workman, 2008, p. 30). The best way that the authors have found to teach the difference between these conceptual notions of time is to use “timelines” along with concept-checking questions (CCQs) (Workman, 2008). These can be followed up with practice exercises that distinguish between the two.

Clearly this is a treatable, global error that can significantly interfere with comprehensibility depending upon the context. Consequently, errors such as this should be given priority over local and untreatable errors since they are easy to teach and can greatly impact the meaning of a text.

5.0 Noun Premodifiers

Koffi (2010) elucidates that English noun phrases may occur with a pre-modifier according to the PSR:

NP → (Q) (Det) (PossNP) (Num) (AdjP) N
(p. 149).

The determiners (Det) can further be represented through PSR as:

Det → $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{Articles} \\ \text{Demonstratives} \\ \text{Interrogatives} \\ \text{Possessives} \end{array} \right\}$ (p. 148).

Most NESs recognize three articles, the indefinite article <a> (and its allomorph <an>) and the definite article <the> (Folse 2009). However, articles can be an absolute nightmare for some ELLs, because some languages simply don’t have articles. Unfortunately for our subject, Chinese is one of these languages. In his composition, several missing articles and quantifiers (Q) are identified, including errors #4 and #17(Appendix A):

11. [...], *when I was senior high school student in China.

12. [...], *I said “My index finger was cut by magazine paper [...]”

From the first example, one common error can be seen: the omission of an article of any kind for a singular count noun. Since <student> is definitely a singular count noun and this was the first time that the author mentioned it, the indefinite article <a> must be used:

13. [...], when I was **a** senior high school student in China.

In (12) the student should have used a quantifier (Q) such as <some> or a quantifier phrase (QP) such as <a piece of> according to the PSR for partitive noun phrases:

$$\text{Partitive NP} \rightarrow \text{QP} \quad \text{N}$$

$$\text{QP} \rightarrow \left(\begin{array}{c} \text{a} \\ \text{the} \end{array} \right) \quad \text{N} \quad \text{of}$$

Therefore (14) or (15) are grammatically correct forms:

14. [...], I said “My index finger was cut by **some** paper [...]”

15. [...], I said “My index finger was cut by **a piece of** paper [...]”

In the area of article acquisition, the Chinese language has a negative effect on its speakers who are learning English. Folse (2009) concluded that, “ELLs who speak these languages (Chinese, Japanese, Korean and Russian) exhibit persistent errors with articles” (p. 179). One way to help the student is to show him the PSR and how determiners and other pre-modifiers are important parts of the noun phrase in English. Another way is to use selective written corrective feedback (CF) that highlights only the errors involving errors related to article usage as demonstrated in Sheen’s (2007) study. According to her: “The results showed that written CF targeting a single linguistic feature improved learners’ accuracy, especially when metalinguistic feedback was provided and the learners had high language analytic ability” (p. 255). Therefore, deliberately highlighting a particular error, in order to promote noticing, may be a more effective method that teachers can use to correct untreatable errors such as with determiners. However, since these errors are local, they should not be the priority of the ESL writing teacher.

6.0 Academic Register

When discussing language use, two important concepts should not be ignored: Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency (CALP) and Basic Interpersonal Communication Skills (BICS). CALP is the language necessary to understand and discuss content in the classroom, while BICS is the language necessary for day to day living, including conversations with friends and other informal interactions (Koffi, 2010). From their definitions, a clear distinction can be made that CALP is more relevant to the written environment and BICS is more related to an oral setting. In this particular situation, the subject used the coordinating conjunctions <and> and <but> in sentence initial position (errors #5 and #29 in Appendix A) instead of conjunctive adverbs such as <in addition> and <however>, respectively. The former are generally used in an informal register whereas the latter are more appropriate for a formal or academic register (Koffi, 2010). In fact, prescriptive grammarians would frown upon sentence initial coordinating conjunctions (SICCs) being used at all. Actually, for this type of narrative-style composition the use of SICCs is acceptable nowadays (Koffi, 2010), but it would be beneficial to teach the student the difference in registers and encourage him to use a plethora of conjunctive adverbs to denote transition to create a higher quality of academic and professional writing. Again, this is a local error so not overly important, but it is “very” treatable and thus can be adequately taught to students in perhaps just one solid mini-grammar lesson.

7.0 Conclusion

The Cognitive Code Approach is indubitably a powerful tool for L2 teachers. However, deciding which grammar points to include in error-analysis activities is not just a matter of jotting down pupils' mistakes. It requires skilled decisions about germane issues to focus on; decisions that the instructor is able to make based on his/her experience as an ESL/EFL teacher and level of expertise in pedagogical grammar so that errors can be systematically classified and the source of these errors dealt with in an expeditious manner.

With regards to teaching strategy, the error analysis activities designed by the teacher and carried out by the tutor are intended to stimulate students to explore and decipher English syntax. There is no longer any doubt in SLA or linguistic circles that the explicit teaching of grammar is essential for academic success. Therefore, teachers should have a thorough knowledge of traditional grammar, prescriptive grammar, descriptive grammar and sociolinguistics so that they can best help their students to acquire L2 grammar and succeed academically in an English-speaking environment.

Narrowing down to this specific case, if ESL teachers are faced with Chinese ESL learners, one of the first steps to improve their grammar skills, especially in writing, is to train them to think from an English perspective. They should be guided to not rely on direct translations from Chinese to English. Therefore, ELLs should try to write in English by thinking in English and learn that making errors is an important part of the acquisition process. In this manner, by systematically analyzing their errors, ELLs can acquire the target forms and make appropriate adjustments to their inter-language.

To conclude, when learners can make sense of their own errors, and learn to avoid them as the result of consistent and comprehensible cognitive strategies, they are more likely to try to change and thus further acquire the target language.

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Paul Keyworth is a graduate student in the MA TESL/Applied Linguistics program at Saint Cloud State University. He has spent the past 11 years teaching EFL/ESL to children and adults in South Korea, Singapore, the UK, and the US. He earned a BS degree from the University of Kent at Canterbury in Molecular and Cellular Biology and attained the Certificate in English Language Teaching to Adults (CELTA) in 2008. His area of interest is acoustic phonetics and phonology, particularly in relation to Korean and Chinese speakers of English. He plans to pursue a PhD in this field. E-mail: kepal104@stcloudstate.edu

Qian Li is a graduate student in the MA TESL/Applied Linguistic program. She is an international student from China. She earned a BA degree from the Nankai University Binhai College in China. Being an ESL learner herself and also working as an ESL teaching assistant in Intensive English Center in Saint Cloud State University, she is interested in how ESL learners, especially Chinese students acquire and improve English in native-speaking surroundings. E-mail: liqi1102@stcloudstate.edu

Recommendation: This paper was recommended for publication by Professor Ettien Koffi, Ph.D., Linguistics Department, St. Cloud State University, St. Cloud, MN. Email: enkoffi@stcloudstate.edu

References

- Burt, M. K. (1975). Error analysis in the adult EFL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly*. 9:1, 53-63.
- Celce-Murcia, M. (1991). Grammar pedagogy in second and foreign language teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*. 25:3, 459-480.
- Celce-Murcia, M., & Hilles, S. (1988). *Techniques and resources in teaching grammar*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Cowan, R. (2008). *Keys to teaching grammar to English language learners: A practical handbook*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Decarrico, J. S. (2001). Vocabulary learning and teaching. In M. Celce-Murcia (Ed.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (pp. 285-399). Boston: Heinle Cengage Learning.
- Dictionary.com*. (n.d.). Retrieved April 22, 2012, from <http://www.dictionary.com>
- Ellis*. (n.d.). Retrieved August 31, 2012, from http://www.usbem.com/pearson_ellis/about_ellis/Principles%20of%20SLA.pdf
- Ellis, R. (2006). Current issues in the teaching of grammar: An SLA perspective. *TESOL Quarterly*. 40:1, 83-107.
- Ferris, D.R. (2002). *Treatment of error in second language student writing (1st edition)*. Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan Press.
- Ferris, D. R. (2004). The “grammar correction” debate in L2 writing: Where are we, and where do we go from here? (and what do we do in the meantime...?). *Journal of Second Language Writing*. 13, 49-62.
- Folse, K. S. (2009). *Keys to teaching grammar to English language learners: A practical handbook*. Michigan, MI: The University of Michigan Press.
- Frodeson, J. (2001). Grammar in writing. In M. Celce-Murcia (Ed.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (pp. 359-366). Boston: Heinle Cengage Learning.
- Gass, S.M. & Selinker, L. (2008) *Second language acquisition: An introductory course (3rd edition)*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Hinkel, E. (1992). L2 tense and time reference. *TESOL Quarterly*. 26:3, 557-572.
- Koffi, E. (2010). *Applied English syntax: Foundations for word, phrase, and sentence analysis*. Dubuque, IA: Kendall Hunt.
- Kroll, B. M., & Schafer, J. C. (1978). Error-analysis and the teaching of composition. *College Composition and Communication*. 29:3, 242-248.
- Myers, S. A. (2003). Reassessing the “proofreading trap”: ESL tutoring and writing instruction. *The Writing Center Journal*. 24:1, 51-70.
- Sheen, Y. (2007). The effect of focused written corrective feedback and language aptitude on ESL learners’ acquisition of articles. *TESOL Quarterly*. 41:2, 255-283.
- Sipple, J. M. (1978, March 30 – April 1). *Error analysis: How to translate it into positive teaching*. Paper presented at the Conference on College Composition and Communication, Denver, Colorado. Paper retrieved from <http://www.eric.ed.gov/PDFS/ED161044.pdf>
- Truscott, J. (1996). The case against grammar correction in L2 writing classes. *Language Learning*. 46, 327-369.
- Workman, G. (2008). *Concept questions and timelines*. Oxford: Gem Publishing

Appendix A

The Police

The policemen¹, who are responsible for defending the people's and the country's interests, are the first one² I want to call for help when I suffer in an emergency or dangerous situation.

I used to call the policemen one time³ for someone stealing my purse at the mall, when I was senior high school student⁴ in China. They came to find me within 5 minutes. At first they tried to calm me down. And⁵ then they collected the general information of⁶ me and asked the details of what had happened. Although they couldn't find the thief eventually⁷, most of them have the sense of security and look like⁸ very courageous, professional and serious. However, when I drove on the street, I usually felt a little bit nervous of the policemen who were standing in the center of the cross⁹ and staring at every driver passing by them, even although¹⁰ I have never break¹¹ traffic rules.

I haven't interacted with American policemen yet, but I've saw¹² them in many places, such as on the street or the mall and the airport¹³. Actually I am not sure they were the policemen or public securities or customs officers¹⁴. The most impressive time was¹⁵ when they asked me to put my fingers on the fingerprint-reader,¹⁶ I said "My index finger was cut by magazine paper¹⁷ on the plane, so does it the matter?¹⁸" "Woo, en..en... how did you get it" he asked with the¹⁹ weird voice. "Just kidding! You are fine exactly²⁰!" and then we laughed. So the sense of humor is the characteristic of policemen in the United State²¹ rather than²² the Chinese policemen, isn't it?

After watching the video, I feel their work is more dangerous than I imagine.²³ We should respect them and their works²⁴ appreciatively²⁵. They are usually patient to explain the rules to the people even to those²⁶ who might have no patient²⁷ to listen. This TV show clip is so cliffhanging, which I think more popular²⁸ among guys rather than girls. But²⁹ it is still a really nice TV show¹.

¹ Errors are shaded grey or underlined where words have been added and indexed according to the error-analysis in Appendix B.

Appendix B

Table 1

Syntax Error Analysis of L2 Writing Sample “The Police”

No.	Error Type	Treatable	Untreatable	Global	Local
1.	Collective Noun	✓			✓
2.	Subject-Verb Agreement	✓			✓
3.	Auxiliary (modal) Verb <used to>	✓		✓	
4.	Indefinite Article		✓		✓
5.	Coordinating Conjunctions in Sentence Initial Position: BICS vs. CALP (academic register)	✓			✓
6.	Preposition/Thematic role		✓		✓
7.	Temporal Adverb		✓	✓	
8.	Linking verb (stative) + adjective vs. Preposition of comparison	✓		✓	
9.	Compound Noun	✓		✓	
10.	Conjunctive Adverb	✓			✓
11.	Present Perfect Tense (past participle)	✓			✓
12.	Present Perfect Tense (past participle)	✓			✓
13.	Syntactic Symmetry Constraint in Coordinating Conjunctions	✓			✓
14.	Conditional Mood (conjunctions of condition)	✓			✓
15.	Subordinating Conjunction of Time	✓		✓	
16.	Coordinating Conjunction vs. Punctuation	✓			✓
17.	Quantifier/Partitive Quantifier		✓		✓
18.	Definite Article		✓		✓
19.	Definite Article		✓		✓
20.	Degree Word/Collocations	✓		✓	
21.	Pluralized Collective Noun (proper noun)	✓			✓
22.	Morphemes of the Comparative	✓		✓	
23.	“ever”	✓			✓
24.	Mass Noun vs. Count Noun	✓			✓
25.	Modality Adverb		✓		✓
26.	Relative Pronouns and Embedding	✓		✓	
27.	Homophone (adjective vs. noun)	✓		✓	
28.	Linking Verb (stative) + degree word + adjective	✓			✓
29.	Coordinating Conjunctions in Sentence Initial Position: BICS vs. CALP (academic register)	✓			✓